

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT OF OHIO
HAMILTON COUNTY, OHIO

STATE OF OHIO,	:	APPEAL NOS. C-140465
		C-140466
Plaintiff-Appellee,	:	C-140467
		TRIAL NOS. B-1304127
vs.	:	B-1304221
		B-1305771
RAYSHAWN STALEY,	:	
		<i>JUDGMENT ENTRY.</i>
Defendant-Appellant.	:	

We consider these appeals on the accelerated calendar, and this judgment entry is not an opinion of the court. *See* S.Ct.R.Rep.Op. 2; App.R. 11.1(E); 1st Dist. Loc.R. 11.1.1.

In the case numbered B-1304127, defendant-appellant Rayshawn Staley pled guilty to burglary, attempted aggravated burglary and having a weapon while under a disability. The court imposed a two-year prison term for the burglary offense, to be served consecutively to concurrent one-year prison terms for the attempt and weapon offenses. In the case numbered B-1304221, Staley pled guilty to theft of a motor vehicle, for which the court imposed a one-year prison term. In the case numbered B-1305771, Staley pled guilty to two counts of burglary. The court imposed a two-year prison term on each count and ordered them to be served consecutively to each other. The court ordered that the sentences in the three cases be served consecutively, for an aggregate prison term of eight years.

Staley now appeals from the trial court's judgments. In a single assignment of error, he argues that the trial court erred by imposing consecutive sentences without making the required findings under R.C. 2929.14(C). This argument is without merit. The trial court made the necessary findings under R.C. 2929.14(C)(4) to support the imposition of consecutive sentences, and those findings are supported by the record. *See*

State v. Jacquillard, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-140001, 2014-Ohio-4394. We, therefore, overrule Staley's sole assignment of error and affirm the trial court's imposition of consecutive sentences.

While the trial court made the required findings for consecutive sentences on the record at the sentencing hearing, it failed to make the findings a part of the sentencing entries as required by the Ohio Supreme Court's decision in *State v. Bonnell*, 140 Ohio St.3d 209, 2014-Ohio-3177, 16 N.E.3d 659. Consequently, we affirm the judgments of the trial court, but remand the causes for nunc pro tunc orders correcting the omission of the consecutive-sentences findings from the sentencing entries. See *State v. Thomas*, 1st Dist. Hamilton No. C-140070, 2014-Ohio-3833, ¶ 9; *Jacquillard* at ¶ 9.

A certified copy of this judgment entry is the mandate, which shall be sent to the trial court under App.R. 27. Costs shall be taxed under App.R. 24.

HENDON, P.J., DEWINE and STAUTBERG, JJ.

To the clerk:

Enter upon the journal of the court May 6, 2015

per order of the court _____.

Presiding Judge